

See

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

—AFFILIATED—

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF DAY NURSERIES, INC.

130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

VOL. XVI, No. 8

BULLETIN

OCTOBER, 1937

Adoption

GEORGE J. MOHR, M.D.

(This address was delivered at the Midwest Regional Conference of the Child Welfare League of America in Chicago, March, 1937. Dr. Mohr is Associate Professor of Juvenile Behavior at the University of Illinois College of Medicine and President of the American Orthopsychiatric Association.)

ADoption involves the interests of the adoptable child, the child's natural parents, the community, and the adoptive parents. It is assumed that the family setting is the most favorable one for rearing and training of the child, and that when conditions permit, a child deprived of opportunity of having care in the home of his natural parents should have that opportunity in an adoptive home. I shall attempt to discuss briefly some of the problems involved as seen by the physician who comes into contact with these children and their parents, usually *after* adoption has been accomplished, for good or ill.

A word first as to the natural parents of children who are considered for adoption. I am among those who would attempt, before adoption is advised, to investigate closely the possibility of a child remaining with one or both of the natural parents. It is obvious that numerous occasions arise in which practical and humane considerations indicate the prompt separation of a child from a situation in which his presence can only be burdensome for the parents and for him, but a too great readiness to assume that the child cannot or should not remain with a parent will result in failure to exploit the constructive possibilities of a profound experience. The bearing of a child provokes far-reaching biological and psychological changes and effects that not infrequently are of such a nature as to influence favorably the possibility of even an unwanted child remaining with the mother. While the interests of the child should not be secondary to those of the mother who might well benefit in many ways by remaining responsible for the care of her child, the likelihood is great that if the mother can benefit and develop into a more responsible individual, the interests of the child too will be well served.

It is common sense that a child, to be adoptable, should be physically and mentally a reasonably "normal" child. I say "reasonably normal" because such latitude may be considered in attempting to define the range of so-called normality of various traits. It would be obvious, however, that certain minimal standards or physical health and growth potentialities should be expected before a child could be considered suitable for adoption. Familial or hereditary disease conditions may militate against the expectancy of healthy physical growth and development. Evidence of such diseases should be sought for or ruled out both in the family background of the child to the extent that this can be known, and in the child himself. Congenital lues obviously should be sought for. Tuberculosis in the very young child offers a handicap that might well contraindicate adoption. Degenerative diseases of the nervous system, sensory deficiencies, and other developmental defects may interfere with the possibility of normal growth, or at least seriously handicap the eventual physical capacities of the child.

It is not to be assumed that the presence of such conditions as I have just mentioned necessarily contraindicate the adoption of a child, though it is obvious that in many instances adoption would absolutely be contraindicated. I wish merely to emphasize the necessity of attempting to evaluate the probabilities of normal physical development of the child before turning him over to adoptive parents. A minor advantage of achieving children through adoption rather than through procreation should be the opportunity to guard against some deficiencies that may have to be accepted in one's own child, but that may possibly be eschewed in adopting children. Perhaps even more concern centers about the intellectual development of the prospective adoptive child than about the problems of physical growth. This concern

(Continued on page 4)

Child Welfare Marches On

IN 1933 your correspondent represented the Child Welfare League of America at the National Convention of the American Legion in Chicago. This year, for the first time since 1933, she again attended the Legion Convention, this time representing the Children's Bureau at the meetings of the Legion's National Child Welfare Division.

In the intervening years there have been many social and economic developments in the United States affecting child welfare. It would not be strange if the Legion decided that it could now rest upon its oars and continue to have merely a passive interest in what happens to underprivileged children. Fortunately, however, the Legion gave every evidence of continuing its child welfare program in order that more children may be properly safeguarded at birth, may be given a chance to survive infancy, may have the advantage of family life, may be helped over the pitfalls that too often lead to delinquency, and when their own families fail them, may be given adequate care and protection. In order to see that these things are competently done, the Legion expressed its interest in efficient administration of all services to children, both public and private, and reaffirmed its obligation to protect the interests of the childhood of the Nation.

During the past year the Legion, through its Child Welfare Division, has placed special emphasis upon the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency. A report prepared by Milt Campbell, at present on the administrative staff of the Child Welfare Division, in charge of the Child Welfare Special Service Study, is an important contribution to this aspect of child-welfare services.

To read through the various resolutions which the Legion has adopted since 1925 is, in effect, to read a summary of the provisions for child health and welfare which were finally included in the Social Security Act. Thus, in 1937, the Legion Child Welfare Division faces new and greater responsibilities than at any period in its history. The job now to be done is to translate the provisions of State and Federal laws relating to children into actual services of such high standard that they will achieve the objectives contemplated and justify the investment of public funds. This can be done only through competent administration, as the Legion long since learned and has clearly demonstrated in the administrative set-up of its own Child Welfare Division. Therefore, every town, county, state and federal administrative unit

having anything to do with providing services for children becomes a matter of primary concern to the Legionnaires.

One of the most important of the ten resolutions unanimously adopted at the New York Convention and which should be read in their entirety by all children's workers is the following:

"BE IT RESOLVED That The American Legion since the establishment of its Child Welfare Program being pledged and having carried on activity in all of the States to secure aid to dependent children, and a precedent having been set by the Federal Government of matching on an even basis State appropriation of certain forms of public assistance, The American Legion recommends that the same precedent be followed in Federal-assisted aid to dependent children."

The Legion is interested in the fact that 50 States and Territories are participating with the Federal Government in the program for Old Age Assistance, at a total annual cost of about \$243,000,000, while 39 States and Territories are participating in the Aid to Dependent Children program at a total annual cost of about \$40,000,000. The Child Welfare Committee gave evidence of accepting responsibility for making sure that in the process of expanding mothers' aid into aid to dependent children, the best features of the original mothers' aid programs are conserved; and the old abuses of inefficient administration and inadequate grants are not countenanced in the new program.

As was true in 1933, one marveled at holding the attention of several hundred people at the Sunday afternoon meeting, when bands were playing in all the hotels, new delegations were arriving every few minutes, and The Greatest Show On Earth was gaining momentum for the days to come. It is doubtful whether any social worker in the country other than Emma Puschner, Director of the Legion's National Child Welfare Division, could have put sufficient vitality and imagination into the child-welfare program of a huge lay group to rally the support and intelligent interest in modern child welfare procedures which the Legion has put into its National Child Welfare Division. It would be fitting for the social workers of the country and the Legion to join forces and salute "Emma" for the service she has rendered to each.

Any idea that New York would be unaffected by the Legion Convention was discarded early Saturday night when the "Forty Et Eight" decided to help

direct the traffic at Times Square. Some of the staidest of the staid hotels which opened their doors to the visiting delegations expressed shock from the front door to the roof as bands marched into the lobbies, but along with the shock there was an element of thrill. Even the old ladies who were permanent guests did a little gentle foot-tapping when the bands played "Dixie."

Children from the East Side swarmed around the section of the city where the parade formed. Two little Italian boys ran along the street, pulling several stalks of corn, nine or ten feet high, which the delegates from the corn belt had given them. As the various Legion Posts fell into place by States, the watching children seemed to get the idea that the forty-eight States are something other than lines on a map.

Even the solemn and stately halls of the Russell Sage Foundation building were affected by the camaraderie of the Legion. For the first time in the experience of this observer, two tiny children—and Chinese children they were—were found chasing each other around the lower halls and helping themselves to a drink, unmolested.

It is true the Legion is getting a little bit stout around the middle and that even some of the "Forty Et Eight" found it hard to stay up all night and then parade most of the next day. But the Legion still is militant in its interest in the well-being not only of its own children but of all children. It knows that its job will never be done until the essentials of a safe and happy childhood are provided for every child. The Legion, as is true of the rest of us, cannot march to the stirring music of bands every day in the year. However, the Legion, to the accompaniment of bands, uniforms, flying colors, and horse-play, can and does renew its faith each year in its objective to do its part to the end that the United States may fulfill its promise of "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness" for every child.

—MARY IRENE ATKINSON

Mrs. CHARLES S. BUTLER of Boston, Massachusetts, was elected on May 14, 1937, to fill the unexpired term of Mrs. Paul B. Welles, as President of the National Federation of Day Nurseries.

Mrs. Butler has been active for many years in day nursery work in Boston, where she was previously President of the South End Day Nursery. She is Director of the New England Region of the National Federation and also represents the National Federation on the League's Board.

News Notes

MR. J. N. McCULLY, Rural Councillor of the St. Vincent de Paul Society of Detroit, makes an interesting report on the rural activities of boys and girls who have been placed in foster family care in counties within easy reach of Detroit.

Four of the Society's wards were selected for what are called Baby Beef Projects. They were faithful in their duties in their foster homes, had shown keen interest in the raising of steers, and seemed to possess the necessary requisites for a successful project. Three of the boys showed their steers at the Junior Livestock Show at Detroit. One boy's steer in the Angus class was sold at public auction, netting its owner a profit of \$68 plus first place premium money of two fairs at which it was shown. The other boys were not able to show as great profit, as their steers did not obtain as high place in the Hereford class. All the boys paid their notes at the bank and two of them started savings accounts.

A number of sewing clubs were organized for girls, the materials being supplied by persons who were interested. Some very fine garments were made and were accepted at local and county fairs.

During the summer the girls were chiefly interested in canning and food preparation projects. The boys' interests were gardens, swine, sheep, poultry, dairy heifer, potatoes, and specialized farm crop projects.

These projects have suggestions for other member-agencies who place their children in rural areas and are seeking to interest them in the life on the farm.

UNDER cooperative agreements between county officials and the State Department of Public Welfare, four counties in Georgia have employed workers for specialized child welfare services. Plans are under way to carry on in other counties this work, which is made possible by a Federal grant for child welfare services in predominantly rural areas.

In addition to the organization of certain counties for demonstration work, district supervisors of the Child Welfare Division of the State Department of Public Welfare will be available to all county departments of public welfare to assist them in working out plans of care for children presenting urgent problems.

While aid to dependent children to be administered by the Public Assistance Division will go far toward meeting the problems of the majority of dependent and neglected children, it is not expected to reach needy children not living with relatives, children requiring permanent institutional care, or children presenting serious problems of delinquency.

BULLETIN

Published monthly (omitted in July and August) as the official organ of the Child Welfare League of America and the National Federation of Day Nurseries.

C. C. CARSTENS, Editor

The Bulletin is in large measure a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

Annual subscription, \$1.00

Single copies, 10c.

Checks payable to Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

Sex Crimes

WE have recently become aware of what seems like a wave of brutal child murders in various parts of the country. The public demand for vigorous action to capture and punish the culprits as a deterrent is certainly justified.

But for every case of child murder accompanied by sex abuse there are probably a hundred or more cases of rape, incest and other sex crimes against children—often girls not yet in their teens. Aside from the physical act these crimes usually have a permanent demoralizing effect upon them.

Punishment of the offender, important as it is, is not more important than finding ways of saving the victims from the degeneracy which all too frequently results, and, what is still more important, ways of preventing such crimes. At present the necessary action in most parts of the country is left almost entirely to the police and the criminal courts. This is not enough. Neither the criminal law, nor the court that enforces it, gives the child victims adequate protection during the trial. All too frequently they leave the court more demoralized than when they entered it as prosecuting witnesses.

Quite naturally the victims' parents often desire to have the villainies hushed up and dropped from public consideration and actions. Unfortunately this generally benefits the culprits most and the victims very little unless the children's parents are endowed with the unusual wisdom needed for such a complicated situation, which is usually not the case.

The whole problem of sex crime against children needs much more careful study than has so far been given it. Psychiatrist, social worker, judge and teacher need to find a better way of providing protection when the crime has been committed and of preventing it, if possible. Punishment of the offender is not enough. We must save the children.

—C. C. CARSTENS

Adoption

(Continued from page 1)

is justified, as the children who are unable to remain with their natural parents do not represent a random sampling of the general population, and the likelihood of disturbance in the intellectual and mental field is doubtless somewhat augmented. While standardized tests for determining the relative intellectual status of the very young infant as yet are not as reliable as might be desired, certainly it is possible to detect those children who are definitely retarded, at a very early age, and to determine those about whom conservative expectation only is justified.

It is important to rule out, to the extent possible, the likelihood of the child being of unstable constitutional character, due to psychopathy or physical or neurological deviations such as mentioned previously. Excessive irritability, hyperactivity, or the opposite may offer clues to this possibility. Perhaps the most difficult aspect of a diagnostic attempt to evaluate the developmental possibilities of a child is in this field, particularly when no obvious physical deficiency or evidence of mental retardation is apparent. Due regard for unfavorable factors discovered in the family background, meticulous physical examination, a discriminating use of psychological test procedures, and observation of behavior and response to training efforts should offer a basis for judgment.

Not only should a child be suitable for adoption, but the parents with whom he is placed should also be suitable as parents and the home an appropriate one for the particular child. Reasonable precautions must be taken to determine that the prospective parents are physically and mentally healthy persons, or sufficiently so to be able to function adequately as parents. It is highly advisable, too, to understand the particular attitudes of both parents towards the proposed adoption, and to be aware of their motives. For most adoptive parents, the motive is the obvious one of wishing to approximate as closely as possible the normal family setting in the face of loss of or inability to have own children. We must remember, however, that parental attitudes toward their own child vary enormously, and at times to the detriment of the child, and it cannot be assumed that every parent who signifies interest in adopting a child is thereby qualified to undertake care of a child. Perhaps the most obvious requirement of the prospective adoptive home is that the parents be in a compatible and reasonably stable relationship, and that they both fully accept the idea of adoption of a child. If the adoption is carried out in the face of real resist-

ance on the part of one parent, the chance of the child developing a normal or healthy relationship to the parents is greatly jeopardized. As with care of "own" children, the fact of adoption should primarily be in the interests of the child rather than in the interests of the needs of the parents, important as these are. The healthy rearing of any child can be based only on carrying out training procedures and developing relationships with him that are consistent with his needs. The adoptive parents' need to have a child, their reaction to having been deprived, while perhaps inevitable in adoptions, can wreck the possibilities of a successful dealing with the child, if they play too great a rôle with the parents.

There are some particular features of parents' reactions to adopted children that warrant comment. For the most part, we may assume that, in successful adoptions, the parents can and do manifest attitudes towards children that do not materially differ from what one observes in natural family constellations.

The fact of adoption, however, does introduce some features not otherwise present in the child-parent relationship. Some adopted children are subjected to highly overprotective care. Sometimes this is a reaction to the long deprivation the parents have suffered. Some parents are driven toward excessive spoiling and protecting tactics as a reaction to their fear that they may not deal with the child justly because he is not their own natural child. Most exaggerated attitudes of this nature are sometimes seen with parents who have strongly resisted adoption for one reason or another, and are then faced with a child they can accept.

Some of the most serious and trying problems that arise are the result of unfortunate placements of children who definitely are adoptable children but who, for various reasons, do not fit well into the homes into which they have been placed. Occasionally these difficulties center about special attitudes of a parent toward a particular child who, by virtue of his personality or perhaps physical characteristics, strikes an unresponsive chord in the parent. These particular problems can be understood perhaps only with understanding of the individual psychological reactions of the parent. Much more readily understood, however, are those situations in which the child cannot meet the expectations of the adoptive parents, or does not adapt himself well at the cultural level of the family. The infant born of parents of fairly primitive cultural attainments and of modest intellectual endowment may not be able to take advantage of the educational opportunities open to him in

a superior home, and his modest achievements, while possibly representative of the normal achievement of a healthy and intellectually normal child, may be quite inconsistent with familial expectations. To be sure, such a situation arises often enough among own children, but in view of the fact that there *is* more opportunity to avoid such possibilities among adoptive children, consideration should be given this problem in placing children in homes.

It is apparent that children, homes and children in homes require a certain amount of observation and study if successful placements for adoption are to be achieved. As yet, our knowledge of the relative importance of some deficiencies in the family background and our technics for determining the precise mental and physical status of the very young child leave much to be desired. We are, however, in a position to avoid many of the mistakes that are made in adoptions if we merely apply such knowledge as we do have to date.

I think I need hardly mention that adopted children should very early be made aware of the fact of their adoption. In my personal experience, I have yet to see real evidence that the giving of this information is unduly disturbing to children. Children can be advised of the fact of adoption before the age of four years, in a manner that is acceptable to them and offers no threat to their secure feeling that they belong to and are loved by the adoptive parents.

In principle, it would appear that there is no alternative but to fully advise prospective adoptive parents of all favorable and unfavorable known factors that might influence the subsequent development of the child. Certainly they are entitled to know what the reasonable expectations are for the favorable growth and development of the child. Some parents do not want such information and the giving of information to some parents has unfavorable possibilities. Many parents become unduly concerned when they see in their own children attributes of traits similar to those of the less successful members of the collateral branches of the family. Adoptive parents, advised of unfavorable features in the family background of the child, at times tend to be particularly alert to the possible effects of these and a degree of anxiety is injected into the relationship with the child. To be sure, such anxieties are not emphasized with non-neurotic parents, but such unfavorable reactions of adoptive parents must be guarded against and mitigated by full and definite explanation of such dubious factors in the child's background as must be brought to the attention of the parents.

The Relationship of the Nursery to Other Social Agencies

MRS. LAURENCE HAMILL

(This paper was given at the Day Nursery Section of the Ohio Welfare Conference at Canton, October, 1937. Mrs. Hamill is the Executive Secretary of the Cleveland Day Nursery Assn.)

MANY years ago at a conference of day nursery workers everyone was describing the regular routine, and one woman stated that at her nursery each child was given a bath daily. I was interested, as well as amazed, for we had been making a great effort to put the responsibility of cleanliness upon the parents and had met with good results; so I could not refrain from asking why every child needed to be given a bath each day, and with a scathing glance this woman replied, "We give them all a bath, whether they need it or not." I did not realize then how often this remark would be remembered, how frequently through the years to follow when I found myself saying we do this or that I would be halted by a little echo of "whether they need it or not."

In many communities a day nursery was one of the first ventures in social service. Before there were kindergartens in the schools, before there were visiting nurses, state-city employment bureaus, settlement houses or family agencies, the nursery was supplying these needs as best it could, and possibly when other social agencies came into existence the nursery was reluctant to give up its prestige, its contact with the family along so many lines. This tendency to continue service when someone else with better equipment has entered the field has been a very comprehensible, but a very unfortunate mistake which has been all too prevalent with day nurseries.

A second serious mistake has been due to the very simple, convenient but erroneous slogan which we all use: "Day Nurseries are for the children of working mothers." Now, we ourselves know that this is not true. The mothers of children in our nurseries are not necessarily at work, and their children come to us for a great variety of reasons, and the nurseries do not shut their doors in the face of distress. We have children whose mothers are ill, incompetent, overworked; we have children in need of another environment from that of their own homes, but if we conceal the scope of our work with such a slogan, how can we expect the other social agencies to recognize where we can help them in solving their problems of child care?

Is the scope of day nursery work at all clear in our communities? Do we give any interpretation of our aims and our ideals? Have we made other agencies realize the value of what we have to offer?

In the past, nurseries have made two bad mistakes; that is, they go on doing with doubtful efficiency what some other agency has been created to do and is doing extremely well, and here are a few examples: Continuing some sort of nursing service when there is a community-wide nursing program. Continuing to find employment for women who could be placed much better through an agency. Giving out clothing which could be done more effectively by a charities organization. Inaugurating activities which are being provided by adjacent settlements. The list could be much longer. And secondly, they use a slogan which in no way describes their work and make little effort toward a better interpretation. It is then not surprising that day nurseries have failed to make for themselves the place in the social service program which would be theirs by right of age and of a history of achievement which has probably been far better than is generally realized.

It is impossible to lay down rules as to what a nursery should do, for that depends entirely on what other agencies are doing, what is needed in its own particular community, but it is safe to say and wise for nurseries to remember that they should not continue services for which the need no longer exists, and that they should be aware of all the community resources which are available to their applicants. I remember my own embarrassment not long ago when, after making quite an effort to interest one of my friends in providing a layette, I discovered the existence of a society of women who were devoting considerable time to making everything necessary for a new baby. I was, indeed, chagrined when I realized that I had spent my friend's money and deprived this society of the satisfaction of another good deed.

If then the nurseries should not encroach on the services of other agencies, the question might arise as to why they need caseworkers, recreation workers, trained nurses, instead of depending on community resources for such services. Not to encroach does not mean to limit one's usefulness, and if the activities of other agencies do not permit the constant service required at a nursery, it is necessary that the nursery itself provide the needs that cannot be met in other ways. That these needs require skilled workers is only a proof of the value of trained service and of the necessity that such service should be available.

For instance, the visiting nurses may assume all the responsibility for children who become ill. But

at the nursery an early detection of illness is a very necessary part of the daily care of a group of children and the contribution which a trained nurse on the staff of the nursery can make is invaluable.

Kindergartens in our public schools are open to children of a certain age, but the nurseries have groups of children too young to avail themselves of this training and we have all learned that four-year-olds and three-year-olds must have guidance and direction if these groups are to be happy, busy and well adjusted. Therefore, we need kindergarten teachers and nursery school teachers; the more highly trained the better, for the majority of their charges come from homes in which there is some emotional conflict which may create serious behavior difficulties.

Our need for social workers is sometimes difficult to explain when we state that we must leave to other agencies the services for which they have been created and when our nurseries are located in communities with a fine program of casework. Here again there is a situation within the nursery practically its own. We provide day-time care for children, but we should not provide such care without a careful study of the need. Because a mother thinks that her children should be in a nursery is not a proof that her judgment is wise or that she understands all the implications of such a plan. The hospitals certainly could not admit patients upon their own diagnosis, nor can we accept children into the nursery until we are convinced that it would be to their advantage to be there. The clients of nurseries seem to have become less and less the clients of other agencies. A study of applications would, I am sure, reveal that a great change has taken place in recent years; that more and more families are seeking nursery care for their children, but are asking no other assistance from the community. Therefore, it seems only right that nurseries should assume the responsibility for these applications rather than to burden the casework agencies with investigations of so special a nature. There must be the danger that with heavy case loads and countless critical situations the applicant who apparently requires only nursery care might receive slight attention and a really serious situation be overlooked. It is the same danger which we have seen in joint well and sick baby clinics. Under stress of work it must be the sick baby who receives first attention and the well baby program often suffers.

The admittance of a family to the nursery is not the final step but the initial one. There must be close contact and constant evaluation of the situation and a study of not only the child's adjustment but the

mother's as well if we are to know whether by giving nursery care we are benefiting the family or the child, whether we are helping to carry out a constructive plan, or whether we are merely contributing to further difficulties in the years to come. We all admit children whom we know will not remain with us and we admit children whom we suspect should never come to us at all, but we have learned the wisdom in certain circumstances of giving what the applicant thinks she needs as the soundest method of ultimately convincing her that another plan would be more constructive. To tell a family that a child should be placed for twenty-four-hour care instead of admitted to the nursery does not mean that such a placement will be made and we may have lost an invaluable opportunity, when by establishing contact with the family and a basis of confidence and frankness we can eventually reach the desired solution.

It may not be necessary to have a staff of trained people in every day nursery. If it is possible to secure the needed service through other agencies, we should avail ourselves of these opportunities. It may be that in your community you can look to your public school system for teachers, to your nursing staff for daily inspections, follow-up on corrections and health instructions to parents. Dispensaries will provide physical examinations, dental clinics the care of teeth, and your department of child placement or family agency can take charge of the applications for nursery care and of further supervision. Such possibilities make it essential that the nurseries should know the resources of their communities, they should be able to estimate what must be done within their own walls and what can be satisfactorily done elsewhere. The needs of the nurseries must be made plain to other agencies to secure that cooperation without which nurseries cannot function efficiently in a community-wide program of child care.

There probably must be certain rules in order to integrate our program, but rules must never stand in the way of service, which is the real reason for our existence. It is so easy to make rules and never discard them years after the reasons which were their inception have disappeared. Our rules are probably more antiquated than any of our other procedure. Could we possibly look at them in the light of "whether they are needed or not"? Years ago bananas were carefully excluded from every menu, and liver never appeared at any meal. Now the importance of these two foods has been so stressed that we make every effort to serve them. Why do we not seek expert advice on our rules and regulations? Why do we not keep them more flexible, more

adapted to changing needs? Other agencies probably remember our rules more often than our willingness to relax their enforcement. We must avoid a feeling in the community that nurseries can only do certain things and must create the belief that they are ready and glad to do all things possible in spite of limited staff, limited space and limited funds. Our doors cannot be open to all applicants who need nursery care. Many of us have long waiting lists and are asking ourselves whether our responsibilities end when our enrollment is full and how much we should concern ourselves for those children who need the nursery but cannot be admitted. Here is our opportunity to turn to other child caring agencies for advice and relief. We should not keep our troubles to ourselves. We are part of a community plan and if we cannot fill our part it should concern the whole community as well as ourselves. Every other agency should have a feeling of responsibility toward the families we cannot serve and should be ready to assist in the problem created by a full enrollment at a nursery. In other words, none of us can or should try to work alone.

Let us be sure that we do not continue policies for which no good reason now exists; that we discontinue service which can be provided elsewhere. Why should we think of ourselves as day nurseries rather than as a part of the community plan for child care and why should we not welcome and cooperate with every extension of this plan? Let us have objectives and know why we do what we do, and what we should do given broader opportunities and, above all things, let us remember that what we do for the children entrusted to our care must never be on the basis of "whether they need it or not."

Information Service Bulletin No. 4

THE first compilation of material from the No. 12 Questionnaire sent out by the Child Welfare League to its member agencies is now available.

There is material on Executives' Salaries, those of Case Work Supervisors, Senior Visitors, Junior Visitors, Institution Supervisors, and Institution Matrons or Cottage Mothers. Though it is compiled solely from the responses from member agencies, it undoubtedly is indicative of the general trend in child welfare agencies throughout the country and therefore has considerable current significance.

One copy will be sent to members and associate members without charge. Additional copies may be obtained for 25 cents from the League office.

The Life of the Adopted Child

SOME of our members will remember that in the spring of 1933 the League made available to them copies of an article, "The Life of the Adopted Child," which appeared in the February, 1933, issue of *The American Mercury*. Through the courtesy of a member agency, the Children's Aid Society of Allegheny and Western Pennsylvania, 519 Smithfield Street, Pittsburgh, distribution has again been made possible. This article has been reprinted in attractive pamphlet form. It may be secured at 15 cents a copy by writing the above-named agency.

Shadow on the Land—Syphilis

SHADOW ON THE LAND—SYPHILIS, by Thomas Parran, M.D., Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. Reynal & Hitchcock, Inc., New York, 1937. 309 pages \$2.50.

THIS book is written for either doctor or layman, and should be equally fascinating to both. It gives in a clear, interesting, easily read style, an excellent idea of syphilis, its cause, history, epidemiology, treatment, etc. It discusses methods of control, comparing the hit or miss ones which have been used so far in our individualistic nation to those in Europe, especially in Denmark and Sweden. In those countries treatment is not only free but it is compulsory, with the result that it is adequate in almost all cases (98.3 per cent), and cases of congenital syphilis are reduced to a minimum. In the United States it is estimated that 60 to 80 per cent of cases discontinue treatment before having 20 doses; and there is no way of figuring the small percentage of persons who actually complete the full course of treatment. Dr. Parran says: "In the United States it is the best estimate that 60,000 babies are born each year with congenital syphilis." This does not include those born dead.

Dr. Parran's Platform for Action consists in locating cases, by routine Wassermann tests; reporting of cases to the Health Department so that their sources may be traced; making of treatment available for all through the use of public funds when private resources are lacking; education of the private physician and of the people. In his own words—

- "Teamwork of government, professions, industry and citizens,
- + money for drugs and facilities,
- + trained personnel for finding cases, for treating cases, and for teaching the nation the importance of doing these things and doing them well,
- = the eradication of syphilis."

—FLORENCE A. BROWNE, M.D.